

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
PORTLAND DIVISION

**NATHANIEL J. APPLEFIELD and  
LISBETH APPLEFIELD,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**PINNACLE ASSET GROUP, LLC,**

Defendant.

**MOSMAN, J.,**

No. 3-16-cv-00256-YY

OPINION AND ORDER

On August 22, 2016, Magistrate Judge You issued her Findings and Recommendation [17], recommending that the Court grant Plaintiff's Motion for Attorney's Fees and costs in the amount of \$22,284.46 [14]. Defendant failed to object to the Findings and Recommendation.

**DISCUSSION**

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See*

*Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon careful review, I agree with Judge You's recommendation and I ADOPT the F&R [17] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 16 day of September, 2016.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman  
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN  
Chief United States District Judge